LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH — R. P. D.

TEHERAN AND THE ATLANTIC CHARTER — Ivor Montagu

THE STEWARDS' PLACE IN THE UNIONS — J. R. Campbell

POLISH-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP — Dr. Oscar Lange

WAGES AND PRICES — John Austin

LAND WORKERS' CONFERENCE — Jack Dunman

THE NEED FOR A MINEWORKERS' JOURNAL — G. W. Holloway

"CHINA'S DESTINY" — Chen Pai-Ta

BOOK REVIEWS

ON THE EVE

6D

JUNE 1944

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVI. No. 6

CONTENTS

June, 1944

	Page
Notes of the Month—*On the Eve* by R.P.D.	161
Teheran and the Atlantic Charter by IVOR MONTAGU	167
The Stewards' Place in the Unions by J. R. CAMPBELL	171
Polish-Soviet Friendship by DR. OSCAR LANGE	174
Wages and Prices by JOHN AUSTIN	179
Land Workers' Conference by JACK DUNMAN	182
The Need for a Mineworkers' Journal by G. W. HOLLOWAY	183
"China's Destiny" by CHEN PAI-TA	184
Book Reviews—	
Back in the old sewer by QUÆSTOR	189
Shot and Shell by R.P.D.	192
Stalingrad Diary by P.A.	192

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in May, 1944 : £100 : 9 : 11

By nine and eleven we have overshot our target this month. Not a large margin, and not compensating for the many months when we have failed to reach it. While we rejoice at the respectable total achieved, we must impress on readers that it is in no way a matter for complacency, since £100 is needed every month, not just once now and again. Once more, our readers from abroad have sent us several handsome donations, unasked; and from a Canadian Captain in this country comes the following: "Having by chance come across LABOUR MONTHLY and find that I like it, I would like to get it regularly." He sends a donation in addition to the subscription rate. From C.M.F. come "Greetings and sincere thanks for sending me out the L.M., each edition of which is devoured enthusiastically," plus "Something for the fund."

Will readers at home please note, and follow the good example set by both Forces and civilian overseas readers?

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
J. Roberts	3	0	0	P. Mayer		16	6	B. Brain		13	0
G. F. B.		5	0	W.A.A.F.		10	0	J. White		2	6
G. Sargent		5	0	J. Keith		3	0	A. Boyd		3	0
C. Milne		9	0	E. Stout		5	0	P. Gillett	1	0	0
W. Burbridge		2	6	Penrith D.G.		10	0	R. Lang		6	0
E. Reckitt	5	0	0	C. Levy	1	0	0	R. Barnes		14	0
A. Wall		5	0	A. Exten		13	0	R. Pulvernis		1	6
E. P.		5	0	E. Flatters		3	0	K. J.	6	0	0
A. Isaacs		1	6	A. McIntosh		13	0	H. A. B.	5	0	0
Dr. Barrow		13	0	J. Rattray		5	0	R. Manning		8	0
Eric and Norah		13	0	R. Barrett		5	0	B. Kerridge		7	0
F. Penfold		13	0	H. White		3	0	J. Walter		3	0
R. Stevenson		15	0	G. Ullathorne		3	0	W. Harries		5	0
A. Ardy		2	0	P. Pearman		2	6	G. Ramsay		6	6
P. Morgan		13	0	R. Mecredy	1	0	0	E. Pearl		14	0
E. Stiff		2	6	C. Parsons		6	6	D. B. H.		15	0
R. Craig		5	0	A. C. O.		6	0	J. Cockburn	1	18	0
S. Mill		10	0	Druzya Uchitiellya		8	6	R. Morris		10	0

(*Continued on page iii. of cover*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

First Blows—The Impending Offensive—Invasion and Liberation—Diplomatic Preparations — Counter - Tendencies — Philadelphia — Provisional Government of the French Republic—Poland—Jugoslavia and Greece—India After Gandhi's Release—Democratic Vigilance—Exploded Theories —Misleading Arguments—1918 and 1944—Sacrifices for Victory—Italian Offensive—Smuts Again—No "Limited" Second Front—Democracy Resurgent—"The Time Has Come"—Unity for Victory.

THE decisive hour is at hand. On May 9 Sebastopol, the most powerful fortification in Europe, East or West, was captured by storm after three days' final assault. On May 11 the Allied offensive against the Gustav line in Italy opened. On the same day the Three-Power last warning was sounded to the satellites of Germany—to Finland, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria. "The time has now come," proclaimed Molotov on May 10, on the occasion of the presentation of British decorations to Red Army generals, officers and men, "when the armed forces of the Allies are preparing for resolute joint action against our common enemy—Hitlerite Germany—and the enemy will soon feel the power of our joint blows." The preparations are now manifestly reaching completion for the final assault, which will determine the future of the world. All issues must now be judged in the light of the offensive.

THE offensive which is now impending against the final fortress of fascism in Europe, and the central fortress of fascism in the world (for Hitler - Germany remains the world-centre and citadel of fascist barbarism, and once it has fallen, the fate of the Japanese warlords is sealed), is like no other operation in war in all history. This is not only true in a military sense, in the scale of the forces engaged, drawing the men and resources of continents into action; in the new weapons of offence and defence; and in the new conditions of amphibious and airborne attack. It is not only true in the sense of the magnitude of the issues involved, which have brought the question of the future of freedom or slavery for mankind into the concentrated action of a single combined world strategy. It is also true in the military-political character of the conflict: in the new type of coalition of the first Socialist State with the Western Democratic Powers, still represented by capitalist governments, uniting, no longer only for common defence in the hour of danger against a common enemy, but for a common offensive to destroy that enemy, fascism, and for common positive aims to build in unity a world-order of peace and democratic freedom; and in the combination of the military offensive with the liberation struggle of the European peoples fighting to free their lands from foreign conquerors and domestic traitors.

HENCE the offensive is more than an invasion. It is a return; a reinforcement of a beleaguered and hard-pressed garrison, represented by the resistance movements of Europe; a reassertion of the might of the democratic peoples against all the perpetrators of infamies who have trampled the elementary rights of human freedom, national independence and civilised existence under foot. The offensive is more than the assault of a coalition of great armed Powers against a still formidable armed Power dominating Europe. It is at the same time an offensive for the liberation of peoples enslaved by fas-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cism, who are themselves participating in the active struggle. From this it follows that the unity of the divers forces participating in the common enterprise is vital for success.

IT is therefore no matter for surprise that diplomatic interchanges and negotiations have been most actively pursued, and have needed to be pursued, among the members of the alliance on the eve of the decisive military operations, which imperatively require the highest political common understanding and unity of purpose, aim and method. There have been the Stettinius negotiations in London, and the parallel negotiations in Washington, preparing the armistice terms and immediate basis of settlement for Germany, following the collapse of Nazi military power and the Hitler regime. There have been the negotiations on post-war plans, including the international monetary plan, on which a compromise joint proposal has been successfully reached, and the still continuing negotiations on the thornier questions of post-war aviation, communications and economic relations, including the interpretation of Lease-Lend and the methods of collaboration in reconstruction. There have been the meetings of the War Guilt Commission, still proceeding too slowly. There have been the meetings of the Dominion Premiers with the British Government in London, to co-ordinate the common policy of Britain and the Dominions with the world aims of the Teheran decisions. There have been the agreements reached with the Allied European Governments: the Soviet-Czech Agreement, the Anglo - American Agreements with Belgium and Holland, and the Anglo-American and Soviet Agreements with Norway.

NOR have signs of counter-tendencies, running contrary to the requirements of unity and victory, been lacking. The Agreement with Franco Spain, negotiated by Sir Samuel Hoare, although heralded with a blast of trumpets as a diplomatic triumph, showed signal weakness, and, in fact, permitted the continued export this year of over four-fifths the level of last year's export of wolfram to Germany—an outcome which was met with open expressions of United States dissatisfaction. At the Dominion Premiers' Conference the Smuts-Halifax offensive for an exclusive Empire combination, to be counterposed to the "Soviet Colossus" and "American Titan," had to be combated and defeated in favour of the principles of world unity and collaboration agreed at Teheran, on the basis of Four-Power co-operation, not rivalry—principles which were vigorously reasserted especially by the advocacy of the Canadian Premier, Mackenzie King.

AT the I.L.O. Conference in Philadelphia a concerted attempt by certain elements was visible to create a platform, in the name of humanitarian pacifist principles, to plead the cause of Germany and protect the foundations of German reaction, militarism and fascism from the stern measures determined by the Allies and essential for the democratic future of all peoples, including the German people. This offensive was only defeated by the vigorous resistance especially of the delegates of the occupied European countries.

IN relation to the European countries there is still need of urgent steps to establish the fullest and most effective basis of democratic co-operation, and to end the surviving tendencies of reactionary and disruptive policies or the doubts associated with the proposed functioning of such institutions as "G.5." Especially urgent is the full and unqualified recognition of the French National Committee as the Provisional Government of the French Republic, which indis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

putably unites all the forces of French national resistance. There can be no room for confusion as to the civil authority in France, and as to the Government owning the allegiance of all Frenchmen, when the decisive battle is opened with the participation of Frenchmen to clear French soil of the invader. The regularisation of the relations of the other Governments of the United Nations with the French National Committee as the French Provisional Government is of key importance, equally for the success of the Western front, and for the entire future of Europe.

SIMILARLY, the situation in regard to Poland is now ripe for a new basis of settlement, which is imperatively required by the military perspective. Recent events have awakened public opinion in this country to the dangerous part played by pro-fascist reactionary elements in controlling positions in the Polish military command and in the Polish representation in London. The time is ripe for the withdrawal of such elements from controlling positions in order to facilitate the establishment of a representative Polish Government which will act as an effective ally of the United Nations against Hitler.

IT is equally necessary to clarify the present still equivocal situation in relation to Jugoslavia (illustrated in the relations, or absence of relations, of the Foreign Office with Marshal Tito's Mission in London), by the full recognition of the Jugoslav National Committee as the effective Provisional Government. Recent events in relation to Greece and the Greek armed forces have shown especially dangerous developments revealing the activity of reactionary forces working to wreck Greek national unity and impose foreign dictation against the will of the people. The news of the agreement in principle on unity reached at the Lebanon Conference is welcome, and it is to be hoped that this will rapidly lead to the establishment of a fully representative Greek National Government which will unite and lead the national resistance of the entire Greek people.

NOR, in the present necessary concentration on developments in Europe, can we afford to leave out of account the new situation arising in India, and the new opportunities following on the release of Gandhi. The military situation in the Far East, and the vital interests, not only of the Indian people, but of the British and American soldiers fighting on Indian soil, make imperative a new approach to India. The release of Gandhi, although made on medical, and not on political grounds, undoubtedly opens the opportunity for such a new approach. The first indications from Gandhi himself, with his friendly advance to Jinnah and the Moslem League, suggest a statesman-like concern to find a path forward from the present impasse and reach a solution in the interests of Indian national unity and common defence against fascism. At this moment of the supreme offensive against fascism, the release of Nehru, with his outstanding record in the international fight against fascism, could have a far-reaching effect. What is, above all, essential now is to afford facilities for the consultation of the Congress Working Committee, and for joint negotiations of all Indian political leaders, with a view to the formulation of a policy to meet the new situation, strengthen Indian national unity and reach an agreed basis of settlement with British representatives for the formation of an emergency Indian National Government in alliance with the United Nations, which would be capable of rallying the fullest strength of the Indian people in the common struggle for the defence of India, the victory of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United Nations and Indian freedom.

ALL these questions press for attention with added insistence on the eve of the offensive. They are bound up with the task of mobilising the maximum strength of the peoples against fascism all over the world. The urgency of these questions, no less than the indications of reactionary policies which still need to be countered, show the necessity of ceaseless vigilance and intensified activity of democratic opinion to promote the interests of the united offensive and ensure anti-fascist victory.

EVEN in the military field the old vicious and exploded theories of the isolationist air offensive as the key to victory, or of the Italian offensive as "the Second Front" (the *Daily Herald* and Smuts) have not yet disappeared, despite the absolutely firm and precise decisions of Teheran and the absolutely clear and precise declarations of the leaders of the Allied Governments and their military commanders. It is still possible for such a book as J. M. Spaight's *Bombing Vindicated* to appear in 1944 and to be received with wholesale applause from the right wing press. The ecstatic *Daily Telegraph* reviewer describes the theme of this book in the following terms:—

> From 1914 to 1918 military deaths amounted to, for the British Empire, over 900,000; for France, 1,300,000; for Germany, 2,300,000; for Austro-Hungary, 1,530,000; for Russia, 1,700,000.
>
> British Empire figures during the first three years of the present war were given by Mr. Attlee last June as 92,089 killed, 226,719 missing, 88,294 wounded and 107,891 prisoners: a total of 514,993. (*Daily Telegraph*, 29.2.44.)

(It would be necessary to correct these figures today by the subsequent figures given for four years, showing 158,741 killed, and a total of 667,159).

THE *Daily Telegraph* reviewer proceeds to quote Mr. Spaight, drawing the conclusion from these figures:—

> We have escaped at least the holocausts of 1915-17. We have come without having to endure them to a stage in the conflict corresponding to that which we reached in the summer of 1918. By our air raids and our blockade we have hurt Germany at least as much as we had then. We have done so at a cost in British lives almost negligible in comparison with that which we had to pay before we entered on the final round in 1918.

Similarly the *Times Literary Supplement* (4.3.44) reviews Mr. Spaight with equal praise:—

> We have now been brought, by the combined effect of our air offensive and blockade, to a stage in this war corresponding to the summer of 1918 in the last, and we have done so at a cost in British lives which is almost negligible by comparison with that which we had to pay before we entered the final round in 1918. . . . Mr. Spaight builds up a logical well-reasoned case, and in the end most readers of *Bombing Vindicated* will probably find to their surprise that they are bound to agree with him.

IT is difficult to characterise adequately the crass, blind egoistic complacency of this type of calculations and propaganda of the "air-maniac" school, which is directed essentially against the Second Front and calculated to weaken the will and determination of the people to face the necessary sacrifices of the Second Front. No attempt is made to estimate in a rational fashion the value and function of air-bombing and the blockade as factors in a total world strategy which has brought Germany to its present point of weakened strength and approaching defeat. No attempt is made to estimate the total cost in lives—a cost far bloodier than the last war, and made heavier by the delay of the Second Front. Instead, the present weakening of Germany is coolly attributed to the air-bombing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and blockade alone, as an achievement at a "negligible" cost: while the main factor is blandly ignored: that power which has fought four-fifths of the German armies for three years and brought them to their knees, at the cost of miliions of lives; that factor of which Mr. Churchill pithily declared that "the guts of the German army have been largely torn out by Russian valour and Russian generalship."

IMAGINE the situation in reverse. Imagine that the situation of the war had been such that the British forces had been desperately engaging four-fifths of the German forces in active battle for three years, at the cost of millions of lives, and had at last brought them to a standstill, while the majority of the Russian forces, though allied, had remained inactive, with relatively small losses. It is doubtful if the British press would have been able to show such self-restraint and patience under such circumstances as the Russian press. But then imagine that the Russian press were actually to *boast* of this situation, and *boast* of their "negligible" sacrifices, declaring: "We have brought Germany to her knees by our strategic weapons at a negligible cost in Russian lives: this proves the superior efficiency of our strategic weapons." But in truth it is not possible to imagine such a parallel. Only a Munichite bourgeois philistine could have such a thick hide.

IT is still possible for the *Daily Herald* editorial to declare on May 17 concerning the Italian offensive:—

> Without exaggeration, in fact, the Italian campaign, linked with Balkan unrest, can fairly be described as a Second Front in being.
>
> The Allied invasion of Western Europe, when it comes, will be a Third Front.

And for Field-Marshal Smuts to declare in his speech on May 19:—

> It would be a serious mistake to concentrate all our attention and our hopes for victory on the coming Western Front. The Mediterranean Front, which has already achieved such far-reaching results, culminating in the knock-out of Italy, may again prove pregnant for the final end.
>
> The Second Front—which is really the Third Front—has already begun in the biggest air attack ever. This will soon be followed by a great land attack as well. The issue of the great battle for Europe may not be decided by this front or either of the other fronts—in Russia and Italy—but by all three combined.

BEHIND this tedious juggling with numerals ("Second Front," "Third Front"), and sagacious balancing of fronts, on the part of the old opponents of the Second Front, can be traced the desire to minimise the decisive importance of the main mass offensive of the Anglo-American forces in the West. Mr. Churchill has consistently spoken of "the main assault from the West," "the mass invasion of the Continent from the West," the "direct attack across the Channel upon the Germans in France or the Low Countries," "the main attack upon Germany." These publicists set themselves in opposition to Mr. Churchill, President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin and General Eisenhower. By emphasising the *equal* importance of the air bombing offensive and of the Italian front (which Mr. Churchill has consistently spoken of as "auxiliary" and "preliminary") they proclaim themselves advocates of a strategy to limit and restrict the scope and effectiveness of the decisive Second Front in the West. If they can no longer prevent the Second Front, this becomes their final recourse: to limit the Second Front to half-measures, to what Soviet military authorities have publicly warned against as the "ersatz" Second Front.

BEHIND this strategy, in turn, of the old reactionary opponents of the Second Front, can be traced the ill-concealed fear of French Demo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cracy (for France resurgent is already defeating Smuts's prophecies of France as "gone for many a long day," and his confidence in the "greatness" of Germany is already faced with shipwreck) and the equal fear of the consequences of the total destruction of fascism and of the rising democratic anti-fascist strength of all the European peoples. This was revealed in Smuts's desperate plea for a centralised European federation, or "Commonwealth of Europe," counterposed to the Soviet Union (this would mean, in fact, the salvaging of Pan-German domination or Hitler's "New Order") to check the demands for national self-determination and independence, contemptuously described as "a chaos of fragments." The old fear of the "Soviet Colossus" reappeared in his adjuration to his hearers not to be "frightened" (!) of "the rise of Russia." This last obsession reached comic proportions when the aged philosopher solemnly warned the Russian people against the influence of Karl Marx, and piously recommended for adoption the principles of Tolstoy (much use the principles of Tolstoy, in place of Karl Marx, would have been to deal with Hitler).

THESE last attempts of reactionary politicians and discredited publicists to weaken and confuse public opinion on the eve of the offensive are nothing but the signs of the final rearguard actions of a defeated, though still dangerous, minority to delay or limit decisive action. Their propaganda provides the material for Goebbels and his organs to spread their contradictory rumours, to suggest that "perhaps the invasion will not take place," etc., as in his article in *Das Reich* on May 7, and in other Nazi organs, where the line of argument runs that "the invasion may be put off altogether, as there is every sign that it has been postponed; Englishmen are starting to ask why they should undertake such sacrifices with so little sure hope of success; on the brink, the English hesitate because the idea gains ground that what they may today sacrifice for Russia they may need in a third world war; Churchill dare not lead his people any further along so risky a path," etc. This nonsense is only spread to cheer up sinking Nazi spirits; but it feeds on every hesitant utterance in a British organ. There is no room today for the professional spreaders of doubts, whose propaganda only serves the interests of Nazism. The path is plain. The Teheran decisions are precise. The preparations are in hand. The united will and determination of the peoples is behind them. The hour of final action is close.

WHAT is important now is to strengthen in every way effective unity of policy and action at home in support of the offensive. It is unfortunate that the postponement of the Labour Party Conference has prevented that clarification of issues which have been desirable, not only for the inner problems of the labour movement (the public exhibition of disunity of leadership and heresy hunts has not been edifying at the present critical time), but for the mobilisation of mass support and enthusiasm and democratic anti-fascist determination on the eve of the greatest offensive battles which will involve the entire people. Vast questions are arising for decision, not only for the immediate battle, but for the entire future, both internationally and in Britain. The strength of a united labour movement, capable of voicing and rallying all progressive opinion, is more essential now than ever to exercise its full weight within the unity of the nation in support of every policy that is necessary for speedy and uncompromising victory, and to ensure that victory shall be followed by the triumph of the democratic, anti-fascist and social aims of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people. We must strive for this objective, of the unity of the labour movement and of all progressive opinion, as an indispensable part of preparedness and effective action, at the same time as we direct all our practical efforts to the fulfilment of the immediate tasks of the offensive. We are on the eve of tremendous events. The measure of democratic response in this country will have no small responsibility to ensure that the united march of the peoples shall lead to the complete destruction of the fascist armies and fascist domination and the victory of the aims which are inscribed on the banners of the United Nations.

R. P. D.

May 21, 1944.

Teheran and the Atlantic Charter

by IVOR MONTAGU

IN the late summer of 1941 Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt, meeting in the middle of the ocean, drew up the Atlantic Charter.

Its provisions, which have been made widely available,* may be summarised as follows :—

1. The signatories sought no aggrandisement; 2. They desired to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely-expressed wishes of the people concerned; 3. They respected the right of all peoples to choose their own form of Government and desired to see sovereignty and self-government restored to those forcibly deprived of them; 4. With due respect for existing obligations, they would try to get equal access to raw materials for all, including victor and vanquished; 5. Economic collaboration between nations; 6. After final destruction of Nazi tyranny, a peace enabling nations to dwell, free of fear and want, within their own boundaries; 7. Free passage of the seas; 8. General security system against aggression.

In what lay the epoch-making significance of the Charter?

The principles here enunciated afforded a glaring contrast with the theory and practice of the Axis powers. Their proclamation by Britain inspired hope in all the peoples who had been robbed of statehood by the Axis, or who feared that succeeding world-developments would deprive them of independence. Their endorsement by President Roosevelt associated the immense power of U.S.A. with the realisation of these principles, even before America's involvement in the war.

No wonder the Charter thus stood out as a beacon for the peoples.

The remaining United Nations, including U.S.S.R., later subscribed to the principles of the Charter.

The fact that it thereafter became a touchstone of democratic conduct—the treatment of India, the Darlan episode, the British official attitude to the Greek king, in each case the sharpest criticism of Allied conduct is the complaint of its inconsistency with the Atlantic Charter—shows its strength as a weapon in the fight for liberty.

Its strength is likewise shown—in reverse—by its employment as a disruptive catchword by the enemies of liberty.

The Devil can quote Scripture for his purpose. It is therefore perfectly natural that the demons who wish to return to their fiendish old world, and prevent the growth of the new, should be very glib with Charter quotations.

An apt parallel is the fight for post-war monopoly dictatorship today being waged under the banner of free-

* Text in LABOUR MONTHLY of January, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom: that is, freedom of monopolies from control; a type of freedom that automatically involves the annihilation of freedom for all others.

The Atlantic Charter demons use their quotations in the attempt to discredit precisely those measures which may be necessary for realisation of the Charter's principles.

When Mr. Churchill, referring to possible security modifications of Germany's eastern frontier, denied that the Charter constituted a contractual obligation to the enemy, he drew a hornet's nest of Chamberlainites about his ears.

But on this point Mr. Cordell Hull (speech of April 9) is incontrovertible:

> The Charter is an expression of fundamental objectives, towards which we and our allies are directing our policies. It points the direction in which solutions are to be sought. It does not give solutions. It charts the course upon which we are embarked and shall continue. That course includes the prevention of aggression and the establishment of world security. The Charter certainly does not prevent any step, including those relating to enemy States, necessary to achieve these objectives.

Plain common sense.

The true inwardness of the scripture-quoting campaign was revealed by the instructive episode of the seventy M.Ps.

The appeaser Rhys Davies, together with the I.L.P.er Maxton, the Vaticanite Stokes set down a resolution in the Commons which, "bearing in mind the specific promises contained in the Atlantic Charter," jumped violently on Churchill for "conveying the impression that its provisions do not, as a matter of right, apply to Germany," and thus bringing the Charter into disrepute; depressing the Allied population, encouraging enemy resistance, prolonging the war, making permanent peace impossible, etc., etc.

No less than seventy names of M.Ps., principally those of Labour men carried away by the flavour of internationalist demagogy and not looking beneath the surface, became appended to this resolution.

Its complete collapse without being brought to debate seems to have been due less to Churchill's declaration that it would be treated as a Vote of No Confidence—which the sponsors didn't mind, anyway—than to the ingenious amendment put down by Geoffrey Mander which, deleting all the matter after the first phrase (quoted above), continued "is of opinion that these should be applied universally so far as is consistent with the supreme object of making German aggression impossible in future, including in that connection such proposals as the transfer of East Prussia to Poland on security grounds."

This amendment would certainly have sorted the sheep from the goats with a vengeance.

The subtle object of the Charter Crusaders is to undermine the agreements of Moscow and Teheran by suggesting that these are in some peculiar way a "going back" on the Atlantic Charter. The Charter can enlist the lip-service of all flesh. The most hidebound reactionary can pin it to the masthead as an "aspiration," without committing himself, just as he can pray every Sunday for the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth while opposing to the death every practical reform that would be effective in providing even an instalment of it. He does not like Moscow and Teheran precisely because they are that—practical instalments of measures to secure the "supreme object" that will bring the Charter principles nearer of realisation.

Moscow reasserted the unconditional surrender principle; pledged continuation of Four-Power collaboration as the basis of a post-war security organisation; prescribed procedure for the extermination of fascism in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the pressing, and sample, case of Italy; agreed the revival of Austria; and laid down the punishment of war criminals and its method. Teheran* proclaimed the war measures necessary before the Charter can come to life at all, consolidated the Three Power Concord without which the peace cannot be lasting, and emphasised that post-war collaboration and active participation, while available to all nations, large and small, required from these a certain political orientation "dedicated to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance."

"We will welcome them," it added, "as they may choose to come into a world family of democratic nations." No place, that is, for Franco and Salazar or Peron.

Moscow and Teheran, it may thus be said, began to put teeth into the Charter. Those who had been prepared to endorse it as a dream-child liked it not at all as a lusty infant.

Professor Boris Stein puts the matter very exactly in *War and the Working Class* of May 1. He points out that those who now come out in defence of the "purity" of the Charter, and scream about alleged dismemberment of Germany, include precisely those Munichite writers who had no scruples about dismembering Czechoslovakia in favour of Hitler, and today encourage both aggressive claims of Polish reactionaries to Ukrainian and Byelorussian territories and the claims of the Baltic fascists kicked out by their own peoples.

They have by no means laid down arms, and "there is no doubt that, as the pretext of a necessity for a discussion on the Atlantic Charter, another attempt will be made to put over political principles harmful for the struggle against the Hitlerite bloc."

It does not, of course, follow from this that every discussion of the Atlantic Charter must be condemned and that this document must be declared above criticism. The Atlantic Charter is a declaration correctly formulating some of the common principles of post-war world reconstruction, supported by all members of the anti-Hitlerite bloc.

These principles were proclaimed on August 14, 1941. Are they adequate to solve the extremely complicated problems facing the entire anti-Hitlerite coalition of 1944? Could the Atlantic Charter have taken into account the changes in the general international situation during the three intervening years? Suffice it to recall that in August, 1941, the U.S.A. was not yet belligerent, Hitler Germany was at the height of its military power, Great Britain was menaced by a German invasion, and, lastly, the U.S.S.R., suddenly attacked six weeks before the signing of the Charter, was bearing the full brunt of the blow of the German hordes, which were then driving for Moscow and Leningrad.

During the past three years not only have changes occurred in the military relationship of forces, but a series of new problems has arisen which in 1941 either could not have been taken into account or could have been reckoned only in the most general outlines.

The basic principles of the Atlantic Charter are undoubtedly vital and just. Nevertheless, the proclamation of such principles does not yet mean the solution of all the problems facing the United Nations on the eve of the defeat of the Hitlerite bloc and after this defeat.

The Atlantic Charter does not mention the problem of the organisation of international security after the defeat of the Hitlerite bloc, for example.

No mention was made in it of fascism and the struggle against it

* In addition to a declaration including pledges to Iran.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the war and after the defeat of Hitler Germany. These two examples are sufficient to show that, even at the time of its signature, the Atlantic Charter did not supply exhaustive answers to a number of important current problems. This becomes especially clear if the Atlantic Charter be compared to the declarations of the Moscow and Teheran Conferences, which go much further, taking into account the appearance of new problems. But even the principles formulated—the declaration at the Moscow Conference—do not embrace all the problems connected with the rapidly changing international situation. It is necessary only to cite the fact that the decisions of the Moscow Conference on Italy proved inadequate and demanded a number of other steps taken lately.

. . . there can be no objection to discussion aimed at *improving, centralising* and developing the common principles underlying the Atlantic Charter. But the aim of this discussion requires to be the determination of measures capable of strengthening the efforts in the struggle against the common enemy.

As a contribution to that discussion the document entitled *The International Post-War Settlement* and issued as a report by the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party to the Annual Conference that was fixed for Whitsun is of definite value.

Here, though the document rightly emphasises that only Socialism can finally assure the destruction of fascism, the realisation of human rights and peace and plenty for all, equally rightly the greatest attention is devoted to the immediate settlement, the laying of the "foundation" on which future generations must build the "superstructure."

The question of German responsibility, precautions for the future, Three Power collaboration, future world organisation, punishment of war criminals, reparations, frontiers, international economic organisation, are all ably examined. In addition to the present possibilities of the situation, future developments arising from present action are borne in mind.

The Palestine proposals at the end of the document arouse disagreement, and the colonial recommendations, although they contain positive features, are unsatisfactory. There are also certain weaknesses which call for criticism, notably the lack of adequate recognition of the role of the democratic anti-fascist forces in Europe. Nevertheless in its main features and outlook, this is a salutary document.

It is a misfortune that the postponement of the Whitsun Congress has lost it the opportunity, for the moment, of being the subject of full consideration and adoption by the Labour Party. Meanwhile, it will repay careful study and serve as a corrective to further manoeuvres of disruption camouflaged as a Charter crusade.

AN UNOFFICIAL EXPORT BAN?

Last August the export ban on LABOUR MONTHLY was raised, but someone is exercising an unofficial export ban. A civilian subscriber in Egypt informs us that he has not received *one single copy* since he took out his subscription in October last. We are endeavouring to find out at what stage of its journey his copy is stopped ; and would appreciate hearing if any readers have heard of similar cases among their friends abroad, either in the Forces or otherwise.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Stewards' Place in the Unions

by J. R. CAMPBELL

TRADE Union Executives are at the moment deeply immersed in the problems of Trade Union reorganisation.

As is well known, the last Trades Union Congress passed a resolution asking that an enquiry into Trade Union structure should be undertaken. That enquiry has been going forward. An influential sub-committee has been examining the problem at Transport House and there have been consultations with various Trade Union executives.

It is no secret to say that one of the questions which is bound to receive a great deal of attention is the relation of the shop stewards and of shop stewards' committee to the official Trade Union organisation.

There can be no question but that the role of the shop stewards has grown immensely in this war. It would diminish if we were to go into a period of mass unemployment, but that would be scant comfort, even to those Trade Union officials who dislike the shop stewards, for the influence of the Unions would decline also. But if a serious large-scale attempt is made after the war to maintain a high level of employment there is no reason to doubt that the influence of the stewards will grow.

The shop steward has grown in influence and authority, not because of the propaganda of any political party, nor because of any desire to challenge the authority of the Trade Union leaders, but because he is fulfilling important functions whose significance has grown.

He is, for example, a negotiator of first instance. With the growth of payment by results he is daily called into negotiations on piece-work and bonus questions. The basic rate of wages and the minimum rate for piece-workers may be settled by national negotiations, but the actual piece-rate or bonus rate which the worker gets in the workshop is settled by the strength of the workshop organisation and the negotiating ability of the shop stewards. The development of mass-production methods is likely to be accompanied by a growth of piece-work and the role of the shop steward as a negotiator of the first instance is likely to grow.

Welfare, embracing everything from the character of the washing and lavatory accommodation, to factory sports and entertainments and the efficiency of the factory canteen, is a factor of growing importance in the modern factory. The broad principles of welfare might be negotiated nationally, their actual details are a matter for negotiation at the workshop level.

The question of discipline will be of prime importance. The great mass of the workers will object to the right of arbitrary dismissal being restored to managements. The Trade Union Congress has indicated that it favours some form of appeal against dismissal and it is certain that the workers, whatsoever the legislative position, will be prepared to use their organised strength, in order to reduce it to a minimum.

It is a moot point whether the interest in production which the workers have displayed in the war industries can be sustained in peace-time. A great deal will depend on the Government and its policy. Yet, despite employers' profits, there is a sense in which it is as essential to have an efficient building industry in peace-time as it is to have an efficient ship-building industry in war-time. It is also true that piecework ers' earnings may be affected by the general efficiency of the enterprise in which they work.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Given two factories where the workers are equally well-organised, the most efficient factory is likely to yield the highest piecework earnings. We should say that the worker is likely to carry over his interest in production to peace-time industry (1) in those industries where a high level of production can most easily be seen to be related to the public interest and (2) where the efficiency of the firm may have a direct, easily understood, relation to the workers' earnings. One can quite easily foresee a situation where shop stewards are asked to agree to a downward revision of piece-rates on the ground that they "do not pay" the firm and where the workers, rejecting any cuts, put forward the alternative that the firm should eliminate inefficient methods of work. In such situations the shop stewards will have a big role to play.

Clearly the Unions cannot curb those many-sided activities of the shop stewards' movement without curbing their own development.

If State control of industry remains after the war, the Unions will claim a larger share in its administration at all stages, from the central control down to the workshop. In their own interests the Unions must regularise the position of the shop stewards. Yet it is clear that many Union leaders look askance at shop stewards' organisation.

We could probably summarise their objections as follows:—

(1) The shop stewards have arrogated to themselves the right to make Union policy.

(2) The shop stewards' committees are linked up in an unofficial National Council which is a potential rival to the Trades Union Congress.

(3) They call strikes in opposition to the wishes of the Union executives.

It would be easy to answer the first objection by pleading not guilty as far as most of the shop stewards are concerned and to prove that their main concern is to carry out Union policy. Yet we would have to admit that there have been occasions where the shop stewards have sought to make policy by other means than through the influencing of the policy-making bodies of the Unions. It cannot seriously be denied that great numbers of shop stewards in 1941 embarked on a drive for production committees before most of the Union executives had considered the question.

Nor can it be denied that recent wage claims amongst shipwrights and boilermakers were formulated by the workers through their shop stewards' committees and not through the Union branches. To say that the shop stewards' committees have been formed to usurp policy-making functions is nonsense. But it is true that, having been formed in order to defend the day-to-day interests of the workers, there has been a tendency to assume the functions of policy-making bodies.

But the Union executives ought to ask themselves whether this is pure cussedness or whether it is due to some defect in Union structure.

I think it could be shown that it is in those Unions which lack a democratically-elected policy-making body —such as an annual or biennial conference—that the policy-making tendency is most likely to express itself. In the Unions with an annual conference the shop stewards do always endeavour to make policy through the conference.

The Executives of some Unions which have no annual conference frequently refuse to consider resolutions unless they are passed by a branch of the organisation. If ten branches with an average attendance of twenty members each, pass resolutions on wages policy the Executives will most certainly sit up and take notice. But if five factory meetings, each attended by an average of 200 members, pass a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolution, they will be told that it cannot be considered because it has not been passed by a Trade Union branch.

We think that the tendency to unauthorised policy-making could be reduced to zero if every Union had a regular policy-making conference and if resolutions of Trade Union members in the workshops were given equal consideration to those of branch meetings.

The stewards could be given a more recognised place in such Unions by (1) calling a regular monthly meeting of these under Union auspices, and allowing a number of shop stewards' representatives to be elected to the district committees.

On the other hand, the shop stewards will have to take account of the perfectly justifiable complaint of their executives that they have been so intent on exercising some of their newer functions that they have neglected the oldest function of all—namely, to ensure that all workers in the shop are fully paid up members of their Union. There is a grain of truth in this.

The problem gets more complicated when one moves from the shop stewards of a particular Union to shop stewards' committees which unite the Trade Union shop stewards belonging to different Unions but employed in the same factory.

It is easy enough to devise a policy for fitting the shop stewards of a given Union into the structure of that Union. But how can you fit a shop stewards' committee representing, perhaps, ten different Unions, into the existing structure?

The answer is that you cannot, unless there is a change in Trade Union structure. Yet the shop steward in one factory is deeply interested in what is happening in another. He wants to know what his fellows are doing elsewhere in relation to dilution, the Essential Work Order, the rate for the job, and other similar questions. So the shop stewards' committees throw up machinery for consultation on a district and on a national basis. The Communists were there, no doubt, but to regard the whole development as a Communist plot is just daft.

The whole question would be very much simplified if all the Unions in a given industry were amalgamated, or were all within the confines of a strong federation. It may be that this is the way out as far as the engineering industry is concerned, where the problem is the most acute. If it is true that the Amalgamated Engineering Union is about to enter the Confederation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Unions the problem is on its way to solution. If all the Unions were in the Confederation, surely there is nothing to prevent that body calling together representatives of all the main shops in its area once monthly. So far from this being a burden it would probably be a help to the hard-working officials of that body.

Surely it is not necessary to remind officials that every new development in trade unionism is not aimed at them, or that whatever headaches shop stewards may cause from time to time, their general activity has enormously strengthened the Trade Union movement.

If the all-in Shop Stewards' Committee could be fitted into a united Confederation there would be no need for unofficial committees on a district or national basis, and they would wither away.

In the Kemsley press recently it was suggested that Trade Union leaders would welcome the IAA regulation because it would strengthen their hands against their members. This is an insult to the overwhelming majority of Trade Union executives and officials. When the elected officials of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Unions require the support of the State against their own members then the glory will have departed from British trade unionism.

In their own interests the Unions must ensure that neither the Government, nor the employers is allowed to use this regulation against workshop activity. Pending the withdrawal of the regulation, they should make it clear that they regard workshop assemblies called by the accredited shop stewards as bona-fide Trade Union gatherings, in which the workers must be allowed to exercise the fullest rights of free speech.

We cannot yet foresee all the problems the Unions will have to face in the post-war world. But we at least know that their advance will be determined to a great extent by the enthusiasm and spirit of self-sacrifice of the rank and file. For that reason, the workshop organisation which is closest to the workers and their problems must be given an honoured and responsible place in Trade Union structure.

Polish-Soviet Friendship

by Dr. OSCAR LANGE

(Professor of Economics, University of Chicago)

(We are pleased to print an address delivered in New York last December by Dr. Lange, a leader of American citizens of Polish origin, who last month has been visiting the U.S.S.R.—Ed. L.M.)

THE agitation of a small but very vocal minority of Americans of Polish descent has created the impression that Polish-Americans are opposed to President Roosevelt's and Secretary Hull's efforts to achieve a permanent understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union. This minority is inspired by Polish politicians, who held office under the semi-fascist regimes. They see in an American-Soviet conflict the only chance of a political comeback. Unfortunately, this agitation is supported by most of the official representatives of the Polish Government-in-Exile, officials who were put into office by the anti-democratic regime which ruled Poland before the war. Under the influence of this agitation a minority of Americans of Polish descent has been led to believe that the American Government wants to "sell out" Poland to Russia. This belief has led them to support those political groups, such as the *Chicago Tribune*, the Hearst press, Gerald Smith, or Senator Reynolds, which want to thwart any understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union. These groups have now made the "Polish cause" the centre of their anti-Soviet propaganda.

The attempt to sell to Polish-Americans as defenders of the Polish cause people who quite recently expressed their approval of Nazi conquest, while Poland was bleeding under the heel of the Nazi oppressors, is an insult to the intelligence of American citizens of Polish descent. The great majority of Americans of Polish descent see through this game and are unswerving in their support of any measure which will shorten the war and secure the peace. They understand that Soviet-American friendship is such a measure. To learn the real opinion of Americans of Polish descent, go not to the Polish language press, which is controlled by a small minority, but to the Trade Unions, to the local organisations of the Democratic and Republican Parties, to the factories, shops and homes. There you will find the true Polish-American

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion, inarticulate maybe and shy, but manifesting itself powerfully on election day. Slowly, this opinion is now gaining its channels of expression, as is shown by the growth and spread of the Polish-American Trade Union Councils and of the Kosciuszko Leagues, which are led by my friend, the Reverend Father Orlemanski.

Americans of Polish descent have good reason to support the Moscow agreement and the more recent agreement reached in Teheran. These agreements are in the interest of the United States; they will shorten the war and save countless American lives. For the great majority of Polish-Americans, whose sons, brothers and husbands serve in the armed forces of the United States, this alone is a sufficient reason. But it is only natural that they should be interested in their relatives, brothers, sisters or cousins in the old country, that they should ask how American-Soviet friendship will affect the fate of these people. Polish-Americans have a legitimate interest in their kinsfolk in the old country, an interest in the fate of the common people of Poland. If they find that the latter's interest is the same as the interest of the people of the United States, as undoubtedly they do, this must reinforce their loyalty to America and add reason for supporting American-Soviet friendship. It also will add to their determination to protect their kinsfolk, the common people of Poland, from the political machinations of refugee politicians who, for selfish reasons, most recklessly gamble with the future of the Polish nation.

It is not difficult to show that American-Soviet friendship is in the interest of the Polish nation. For what can the Polish people gain from an an American-Soviet conflict? All they can gain is prolongation of the war, prolongation of the German occupation of Poland, of an occupation under which the Polish people are being murdered daily by the thousands, jailed, mistreated and starved into extinction. If the German rule over Poland continues for long, the Polish race will be destroyed biologically, Poland will be weakened beyond repair for all future generations. And yet there are Poles who have expressed the wish—they actually dared to do so publicly in newspapers—that the war should last long, in order that the Soviet Union be weakened. They did so in the comfort of living in Britain or America, while their brethren in Poland are suffering and dying. There are even "Poles" who wishfully look forward to a war between the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Can you imagine a greater lack of responsibility? Any war between the Western powers and the Soviet Union would have to be fought on the territories of Poland. The Polish people have already borne the brunt of two world wars; a third would assure their physical extermination. People who are capable of entertaining such ideas really do not care about the fate of the Polish nation. The Polish nation can only lose by an American-Soviet conflict; it can only gain from American-Soviet and British-Soviet friendship.

American-Soviet and British-Soviet friendship are necessary to safeguard Poland's national independence. The freedom of Poland, as well as of all the smaller nations, will be permanent only if guaranteed by an international system of collective security. The history of this war has shown clearly that none of these nations is able to maintain its freedom by its own strength. Collective security, however, will work only if it will be based on the firm skeleton of a "nuclear alliance" of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union (and China in Asia). Without such an alliance collective security will break down, as the League of Nations did. Poland might again lose her independence. An alternative

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might be found in the division of the world into spheres of influence, with Western Europe being the exclusive sphere of influence of Great Britain and the United States, and Eastern Europe the exclusive sphere of influence of the Soviet Union. The line of division would go, most probably, somewhere through Germany, and Poland would fall, by necessity, into the Soviet sphere. This certainly would reduce Poland's political independence, as compared with collective security. Those Poles who oppose American-Soviet friendship, because of an alleged fear of Soviet-Russian domination over Poland, follow a very questionable logic.

Many Poles have had grave doubts about the Soviet Union's attitude toward Poland's independence. These doubts are strongly rooted in past Polish history, and we must admit that in past Russian-Polish relations there has been plenty to justify them. They are, however, unfounded with regard to the Soviet Union. This is shown by the history of Revolutionary Russia. The Polish struggle for freedom has a long history of active co-operation with the Russian revolutionary movement. Next to Wilson's Fourteen Points, Poland owes her independence to the Russian Revolution.

In this war the Soviet Government has repeatedly asserted its desire to see Poland strong and independent. Many Poles have found it difficult to believe these assertions, and so have many Americans. The stumbling block is the alleged "stab in the back" dealt by the Soviet forces after the Polish Government had fled and abandoned the Polish people. The truth is that there was no "stab in the back." When the Red Army entered the territory of the Polish Republic, the Polish Army was defeated and virtually destroyed. The only alternative left was whether these territories should be occupied by the Germans, who might use the Ukrainian and White Ruthenian population of these territories for building up an anti-Soviet irredenta, or whether they will become part of the Soviet Union's strategic frontiers. The Soviet Union did not "stab in the back" Poland any more than we "stabbed in the back" Denmark by occupying Iceland. The "stab in the back" legend reminds me of the similar legend which was concocted by the German generals in order to save face and to cover up the defeat the Imperial German army had suffered in 1918. Now it serves to cover up the suicidal policy, the unpreparedness and the incompetent leadership of those who ruled Poland before 1939.

If there were any doubts as to the Soviet Union's intentions toward Poland, these doubts have been allayed once and forever by the Moscow and Teheran agreements. The Moscow agreement states clearly that "After the war, United States, British, Soviet and Chinese forces will not be employed within other states, except to make good these principles (of collective security), after joint consultation." By signing this statement, the Soviet Government has undertaken, together with the United States, Great Britain and China, to respect the independence of Poland. It has done so once more in its treaty of alliance with Czechoslovakia, which contains an open invitation for Poland to come in as a third partner. Therefore, those Polish-Americans who oppose the Moscow and Teheran agreements, or the Czechoslovak-Soviet alliance, act not only against the interests of the United States, but also against the best interests of Poland.

The Soviet Union, however, has done more than guarantee the independence of Poland. It is also instrumental in Poland's liberation. The freedom of Poland is being won today in the battle on the Dnieper. The vic-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

torious Red Army is rolling Hitler's armies back into Germany. Soon the Red Army will enter Poland to chase out the German invaders. In this task it will be assisted by the Polish people. It will be assisted by the Polish underground movement, partisans, people's guards, and other Polish patriotic organisations. There is not the slightest doubt that the whole Polish people will welcome the Red Army as an army of liberation and give it full and loyal support. Every Pole in the world will rejoice over it, and so, I can assure you, will all Americans of Polish descent, except perhaps a few, very few, misled divisionists.

There were gentlemen among the Polish exiles who, in all seriousness, deliberated whether they should not demand that the Red Army ask their permission to cross Poland. Maybe, they wanted to erect signposts for the Red Army: "Keep out. Private Property. No Trespassing. Please take Detour through Hungary." There were others, right here in New York, who in press interviews threatened the Red Army with armed resistance, if it comes not as a friend of those who claim to represent in exile the Polish people. Whoever else's friend the Red Army will or will not be, it certainly will be the friend of the Polish people. Do you believe that those who languish in jail or concentration camps, who are tortured by the Gestapo and S.S., who in their cells await the day of execution, who are deported to be slaughtered in death chambers, who in uncertainty await the day of arrest, who are deported to forced labour, who die a slow death of starvation; do you really believe that these people will ask questions when the Red Army comes to liberate them? Do you believe that, before accepting liberation, they will ask the Red Army to produce a certificate of "legitimacy," signed and stamped in London or in New York? And if the Red Army is unable to produce such a certificate, do you believe that they will answer: "Leave us alone. Please, let the Nazis kill, jail and starve us a few years longer"? Indeed, people who believe this, whether here or in London, show how utterly they have lost touch with the struggling and suffering Polish nation.

I have many personal friends, persons whose attitude to the Soviet Union was most critical, even hostile, who have been jailed by the Nazis or put into concentration camp. Many have been killed, others have died, some may still be alive. I can tell you one thing. Those who survive will not ask the Red Army for a certificate of "legitimacy." They will accept their liberation and join with the Red Army in punishing and chasing out the Germans. They will join the Red Army in the acts of retributive justice against the Nazi oppressors. The entry of the Red Army into Poland will be the signal for a spontaneous uprising, for a terrific unloading of the accumulated wrath of the people. It will be a terrible day of judgment over the "master race" and all its stooges, a day of judgment which no power on earth will be able to stop. Armchair moralists may deplore it. But in this judgment, in spite of regrettable excesses and errors which are bound to occur, there will be more historical justice than in the ideas of the moralists, whose superior morality has kept them from becoming indignant over the mass murders, over the extermination of whole peoples (the Jews, for instance), and over all the other crimes committed by the Nazis. The day of judgment will be directed not only against the Nazi "master race" but also against those who acted as its stooges, for instance, against those Polish landlords who accepted from German hands the return of their estates parcelled out to the peasants, in 1939, by the Soviet government. This outburst of justice will forge a bond of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

common understanding between the Polish people and the Red Army.

The Red Army will not come to Poland alone. It will be accompanied by Polish divisions, formed on Soviet territory, which will march alongside the victorious Soviet forces. There are already two divisions in existence, the Kosciuszko Division and the Dombrowski Division ; a third is in formation. These divisions will fight alongside the Red Army, sharing the latter's sacrifices of blood and toil. The Kosciuszko Division has already covered itself with glory in the battle of the Dnieper. The commander of the Polish divisions, General Berling, was awarded the order of Lenin, two members were declared "Heroes of the Soviet Union." One of them is a veteran fighter against fascism, a former volunteer officer of the Spanish Republican forces. Former members of the Spanish Republican forces are quite conspicuous in the Polish divisions in the Soviet Union. They symbolise the continuity of Poland's democratic tradition, the continuity of the Polish people's fight for democracy, as well as the political astuteness of the Polish people, whose sons fought Hitler's and Mussolini's intervention armies at a time when Goering, Goebbels and Ciano were entertained as guests of the government in Warsaw.

Poles should be proud of the Polish divisions fighting with the Red Army, as they are proud of the Polish airmen who fight with the Royal Air Force in Britain, of the Polish heroes of Narvik and of Tobruk, and of the Polish navy and merchant marine roaming the Atlantic. And so should Americans of Polish descent. The Polish soldiers who fight on Soviet soil are not better Poles than those who fight on other fronts, but neither are they worse, as some Polish-Americans want to make us believe. There is no monopoly on patriotism, neither is there a monopoly on service to the cause of the United Nations. Whoever fights against the common enemy, whether in the Ukraine and White Russia, or in the Mediterranean, or in Britain, or in the Pacific, is equally entitled to our sympathy and support. The Polish divisions in the Soviet Union, however, have a particular task to perform. Through their companionship of sacrifice with the Red Army, they open a new page in Polish-Soviet relations, a page of co-operation for the common good, which will wipe out of memory the misunderstandings of the past.

Such Polish-Soviet co-operation was the dream of the late General Sikorski. As early as 1940 General Sikorski had advocated, in a memorandum to the British government, Allied-Soviet co-operation to defeat Nazi Germany. In 1941 he signed first an agreement and later a regular alliance with the Soviet Union. In this alliance Poland undertook to organise a Polish army on Soviet soil. General Sikorski's efforts were thwarted, largely by the intrigues of his opponents among the Polish exiles, within the government and without. But the obligation undertaken by General Sikorski is honoured by the Polish people: it is honoured by General Berling and his divisions. In spite of all divisionist efforts to the contrary, the great majority of Americans of Polish descent have supported General Sikorski in his endeavours to achieve Polish-Soviet friendship. Today they should support those who carry out Sikorski's political and military testament, the Polish army on Soviet soil. This army will participate in the most direct way in the liberation of Poland, it will be the guarantor of Polish freedom and independence.

I have spoken about Poland's stake in American-Soviet friendship and in her own friendship with the Soviet Union. Now a few words about America's stake in Polish-Soviet friendship. This stake is considerable,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because the present Polish-Soviet tension endangers our own friendship with the Soviet Union and the achievement of quick victory and of a durable peace. This tension has been, and still is, exploited by all those who oppose American-Soviet collaboration in war and in peace. It threatens to become an issue of partizan politics, even of electoral campaigns. But to tell the truth, America's stake in Polish - Soviet friendship is less than Poland's stake in American-Soviet friendship. The United States and the Soviet Union will find, and already have found, their way toward mutual co-operation, regardless of Poland's attitude toward it. They do and will co-operate, because it is in their mutual interest to do so. American-Soviet co-operation is dictated by the necessities of the war and by the necessity of peace in Europe. In the near future it will be dictated by strategic necessities in Asia. Poland, whether she likes it or not, cannot stop this co-operation. The danger, however, arises that American-Soviet co-operation may be achieved over the heads of the Polish people and at their expense. This will inevitably happen if large sections of Poles, particularly those who control the means of Polish propaganda and publicity in this country, should continue, as they seem intent to, their hostile sniping at American-Soviet co-operation.

We all have in this respect a heavy responsibility. We must refrain from encouraging among Poles the illusion that Poland will become the occasion of an American-Soviet conflict. Unfortunately, such illusions have been fed amply by politicians, big and small, who have done so in the interest of partisan purposes.

America's interest in world affairs is chiefly dictated by the desire for peace. Our civilisation is not like that of militaristic Germany, which glorifies war and conquest and considers war as the highest goal of human activity. Our civilisation is based on the ideals of peace, opportunity and prosperity. We want our boys to return home as soon as possible. The boys in the armed forces consider the war as a "nasty business," which has to be finished quickly. They want to return home to lead a life of "liberty and pursuit of happiness." America's stake in world politics can be summarised in two words: stability and peace. To these, however, I should like to add a third: *freedom*, without which there can be neither stability nor peace.

Wages and Prices

by JOHN AUSTIN

BUDGET day this year was of unusual significance, not so much for the Budget contents, as for the hints as to future policy put forward in Sir John Anderson's speech as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The portion of the speech in which he said the cost of living index would no longer be pegged at 25 to 30 per cent. above prewar, but at 30 to 35 per cent. and gave his "warning" of the "connection between wages and prices" was received with indignation by trade unionists as a direct threat to the conditions of the working-class, both now and in the post war years.

But this was only one of a series of proposals and viewpoints outlining a policy utterly at variance with the people's outlook for the days on the morrow of victory. Strike out a few of the face-saving phrases about "active employment" and "co-operation in the international field," and the speech

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becomes a charter for Big Business. It pictures a world in which monopoly capitalism, fortified by tax concessions and released from control, will resume the competitive struggle for overseas markets to "recapture some of the export trade we lost in the inter-war years." He hinted broadly that "self-control" (that is, self-government for Big Business) would replace government control as soon as possible. "We all hope to see the end of rationing *and other controls* as soon as we safely can."

And again:

The more incomes are above the level of the increase of prices the more it becomes necessary to intensify forms of control. We all wish to see an end of control as soon as possible. We must make certain that the removal of control would not be attended by violent price inflation.

Naturally, manipulation of the price-level and real wages—always part of the stock-in-trade of the restrictionists—has to be placed on the agenda. But the war has taught the people too much. Rationing, price and commodity control and stabilisation of the cost of necessities—although only half-heartedly applied in many cases—have proved very effective. Despite war shortages, one-third of the people are better fed than ever before.

By Anderson's own admission "our policy has been fully successful"; so he is obliged to invent reasons why it will presently break down! His "facts" are chosen to fit the argument, which is full of fallacies. He revives the exploded theory that wages, entering into costs, push up prices which in turn call for higher wages, and so on in a "vicious spiral." So he proposes to give the spiral a new twist, deliberately, and raise the cost-of-living index by 5 per cent. How prevent wages following? Is the answer Regulation 1AA ?

But the theory is nonsense. In wartime, when most workers are engaged on armaments, wage increases rarely affect the cost of consumer goods.

Anderson further ignored the fact that output per head has soared. In his speech he carefully chose as his example coal, which, because the coal-owners have sabotaged proper control, provides the main exception.

According to official statements, output per head in aircraft industry has been rising at the rate of 2 per cent. per month. Despite the drafting of some five millions of the youngest and fittest workers into the forces and civil defence, the national income (allowing for the rise in the price level) increased by 25 per cent. between 1938 and 1943. Once the restrictive monopolies were broken and the wastes of luxury goods and services eliminated, Britain's capacity to produce for the people would rise by leaps and bounds.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer claimed that wage rates have now run ahead of the "cost of living." His figure of 40 per cent. increase in wage rates may be taken as reasonable—as an average. But the Ministry of Labour Cost of Living Index is a bad joke. Based on a narrow range of necessities on which the subsidies have been concentrated, it shows a rise of only 29 per cent. since the war.

The Treasury's own estimate of the rise in prices excluding the £1,073 millions the people pay out in indirect taxes less the £190 millions ("poured out" in subsidies) which consumers get back—shows a 41 per cent. increase over 1938. Allow for indirect taxation less subsidies, and the rise is 54 per cent. above 1938. This figure more faithfully reflects the rise in the cost of living.

Wage-rates, so far from having risen 11 per cent. above the cost of living, are actually more than 11 per cent. less than the real cost of living. On this the Chancellor's whole argument falls to the ground.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Instead of shaking his head over the course of wages, Sir John Anderson might have pointed to the very much sharper rise in profits. If the White Paper figures are taken at their face value, between 1938 and 1943 the total wage bill (which excludes the "salaries" of a large section of the lowest-paid workers such as shop assistants) rose from £1,728 millions to £2,909 millions, that is, by 68 per cent. Over the same period, profits and interest (excluding interest on the national debt, at least two-thirds of which is received by the rich) increased from £1,317 millions to £2,427 millions, or *by* 84 *per cent.*

The share of interest and profit in the national income has risen from 29.2 per cent. in 1938 to 34.3 per cent. in 1943. Meanwhile consumption in real terms has fallen by 21 per cent.

In this Budget speech, Sir John Anderson, ex-Governor of Bengal, ex-director of Vickers, I.C.I. and the Midland Bank, outlines for Big Business its post-war perspective. The two aims that stand out are (1) reduce real wages in order to facilitate the competitive export drive; (2) get rid of subsidies on food so as to jettison all "inconvenient" controls as soon as possible.

It is one thing to subsidise prices in order that pernicious inflation at home does not occur. It is another thing to subsidise them to widen the gap between prices at home and prices abroad. Such a policy—if pushed too far—might create very great difficulties for us after the war.

Immediate economic effect of levering up prices while pegging wages would be to strike at the lowest-paid—pensioners, time workers with little overtime, women, dependants of the men in the armed forces, ironically enough given a "rise" that very day.

In conditions of scarcity the distribution of available supplies will become more uneven.

But the political effects can be far more dangerous. Whether so intended or not, the Chancellor's speech—presumably approved by the War Cabinet—is hardly calculated to cement national unity. Coupled in the workers' minds with the sinister IAA, it was bound to spread doubt and dissatisfaction. The welcome given to the speech by wide sections of the press—largely an unthinking reflex action to the stimulus of any gesture to appease capitalist cupidity—intensified this effect.

The post-war perspective of the working-class movement is the opposite of Anderson's, the antithesis of the deflationary policy of wage cuts and ugly trade rivalry of the inter-war years which he outlined. The only basis for a lasting peace and economic progress is to expand production to the utmost. This demands continuation of controls and the use of State power to break the restrictionism of the monopolists. It demands a rapidly rising level of real wages to absorb the huge increase in output that will result. It calls for the closest possible international co-operation to promote the rapid rehabilitation of Europe, the U.S.S.R. and the development, both agricultural and industrial, of the colonial countries.

Anderson's speech, its content, timing, tone and reception, is a warning more solemn, and of a different kind, than he intended. It reveals the potential strength of reaction. It underlines the urgent need for working-class unity and increased vigilance.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

Are you following the Guide in your discussions? Send in your reports regularly in the year 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Land Workers' Conference

by JACK DUNMAN

(Secretary, Oxfordshire County Committee, N.U.A.W.)

NO past conference of the National Union of Agricultural Workers can have taken more important decisions than that held at Blackpool last month—decisions affecting not only the immediate interests of the farm workers, but the future development of British agriculture, and thus of the whole British people The conference was one of youth, enthusiasm and determination; every issue was argued out, there was no steam-roller or snap votes. The decisions, therefore, gain enhanced importance as the considered opinions of the farm workers of our country.

The two most important of these—the amendment of the Executive's recommendation to apply for a £4 national minimum wage, to £4 10s. and the acceptance (by a majority of 55 to 43) of the recommendation to open joint talks with the National Farmers' Union on the future of British agriculture—might seem at first sight to be contradictory.

Such a view would not be correct. The decision to open joint talks was a responsible decision taken by a body of workers who, although they have in the past suffered much from the actions of their employers, and still do in many cases, nevertheless recognise that agriculture as an industry has been robbed and exploited by monopoly capitalism in the past, and that their own future advance depends on defeating this tendency in the future. Hudson's recent speech at Maidstone, in which he said that "food shortage in Europe would guarantee the future of British agriculture for four years after the war," but that after that "the future of British farming will, in the last analysis depend on the individual British farmer," must have been in the minds of many of the delegates as a grim warning when they voted for the proposals. Perhaps it was in the minds of the farmers when they took the weighty decision to approach the N.U.A.W. in the first place.

Press reports of the simultaneous publication of an agreed statement on policy under the auspices of the Royal Agricultural Society of England were in many cases inaccurate and have caused great confusion.

The N.U.A.W. sent "observers" to one only of the meetings called by this body, but were in no way associated with the final statement. Reports that this represented "the agreed policy of every section of the industry" were, therefore, entirely incorrect. The whole R.A.S.E. proceedings were, in any case, heavily overweighted with landlords. The President of the N.U.A.W., in reply to a question at Blackpool, made it clear that the proposals for talks with the farmers were an *alternative*, and likely to prove "more acceptable."

Whatever differences exist over wages and other questions, the overwhelming majority of farmers are genuine producers; it is becoming increasingly clear that the main danger to workers and farmers alike is that of a return to the restrictive policy of monopoly capitalism, for ever associated with Neville Chamberlain's Kettering speech in 1938. Thus the working-class movement as a whole will undoubtedly warmly welcome the Blackpool decision as a powerful blow against monopoly capitalism itself.

The independent line taken by the conference on the wages question shows very clearly that the workers will not enter into these discussions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like some kind of junior partner, ready to take someone else's lead. A future policy for agriculture must first and foremost provide a return to the workers, equivalent to their skill and arduous toil, and the conference drove home this point in no uncertain manner. Many delegates emphasised that the Union stands four-square by land nationalisation, and the agricultural policy of the Labour Party.

Food consumers, and especially the organised working-class, who are determined that a proper and adequate diet must be available for every inhabitant of these islands after the war, will watch future developments with interest and sympathy.

The need for a Mineworkers' Journal

by G. W. HOLLOWAY

RECENT events in the mining industry have brought out forcibly the need for a mineworkers' journal. But the whole situation of the coal trade, present and future, particularly with regard to trade unionism, now make this an urgent requirement.

Take the history of the last twenty years. If 1925 saw a very great advance in mining trade unionism and in the solidarity of all workers, then 1926, the year of heroic struggle, also saw in the end the greatest defeat in Trade Union history. For many years after it was a hard and difficult path. The Mineworkers' Federation of Great Britain had been split into a number of practically autonomous districts. Instead of what had been looked to as one union, we had a number of distinct unions, each operating independently and very often against each other. The coal Barons had achieved their objective. The policy of "divide and rule" was once again triumphant. They never had need of lessons from Hitler. The Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Act of 1927 was a further tightening of the shackles.

Followed ten years of complete disunity, with certain black spots of "company unionism" which greatly helped the coalowners in their policy of playing off one district against the other.

1937, the year of the 1s. per day increase, saw us once again on the doorstep of unity as a national organisation. Two years or more of stalemate followed. Then once again on national lines came the war additions, which was another small step forward.

Then came the Greene Award, the first really big step forward on a national scale for well over a decade. All these years, with the exception of one brief period (*The Miner*) we had been, and still are, without a national organ of our own. I think it was this Award that brought to the front the need of the miners for their own paper. The capitalist press concentrated exclusively on the 2s. 6d. a day increase. The anomalies and complications they saw fit to ignore. The result was that the public in general were still further encouraged to regard us miners as, at least, peculiar fellows.

This need of a voice of our own was further emphasised when the Porter Award was published. Posters and headlines blared out the fact that the miners had been given a £5 minimum wage, the biggest of its kind in the country. Here again the national press paid little or no attention to the complications and anomalies of the Award. Public opinion, misled as usual by their favourite paper, came down heavily against us during the recent spontaneous strikes.

On all these issues national leaders must also take their full share of the blame, no completely detailed and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

satisfactory explanation came from them. I admit they are not altogether to blame on this score. They do not own the press nor the B.B.C.

Local lodges, too, are not altogether blameless in this matter, despite the fact that the pressure of local affairs prevents them very often giving that time and attention these issues need. In most cases the examination of such issues are superficial and sketchy.

Whether I have offered sufficient proof of the crying need of our organisation for a newspaper or magazine of its own, I do not know. However, I am convinced that there is such a need. While it is possible for a government in exile in this country to obtain materials for a score or more papers, magazines, etc. and a reactionary Trotskyite gang to run a rag like the *Socialist Appeal*, surely it is possible for the Miners' Federation of Great Britain to obtain the necessary material to run its own national mouthpiece.

There are many things such an organ can do that neither county nor local branches can attempt. Among these are the clear and simple interpretation of national agreements: regular articles on such important matters as compensation, contracts, machinery in mines, roof control and others too numerous to mention.

Surely it could be done on a co-operative basis ? Could not an appeal be made for districts, lodges and individuals to take up shares in such a project? But whatever be the method, something should be done in this matter. The sooner it is done, the better.

China's Destiny

A critique of Chiang Kai-shek's book, by CHEN PAI-TA

(The following critique, published last July-August, in Yennan, capital of the North-West semi-autonomous Border Region of the Chinese Republic, reached us only a few weeks ago, via the U.S.A. The depth of the political crisis in China here disclosed (and raised in the Dean of Canterbury's article in our April issue) has hitherto been withheld by war-time censorship. As the full text of Chen Pai-ta's critique runs to more than twenty thousand words, we print this month and next certain of the more important sections, omitting Chapters I ("On the Chinese Nation") and II ("On Chinese History").—Ed. L.M.)

SINCE the publication of *China's Destiny* in the name of Chiang Kai-shek, Director-General of the Kuomintang, many people in Chungking have suspected that the book was really written by Tao Hsi-sheng. Many people wonder why Mr. Chiang, as the leader of the Kuomintang, should have allowed his work to be written by a person so widely infamous for his association with the Nanking traitors, his constant advocacy of fascism, his opposition to the United Nations, and his continuing ideological links with Wang Ching-wei.

Since *China's Destiny* was published over the name of Mr. Chiang, his prestige attracted the attention of the people to the book. People thought at first that since Mr. Chiang had published such a book at so critical a moment of the war of resistance, it would contribute greatly toward the solution of such questions as how to prepare the counter-offensive against the enemy, or how to co-ordinate the operations of the Allies to win final victory, because, as everybody knows, the factor that determines China's destiny today is the war of resistance and no-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing else. But after reading *China's Destiny* they were greatly disappointed, because the questions brought out in the book were entirely unexpected ones. Out of the 213 pages of the book, only twelve and a half deal with the war problem, while the bulk of the book deals with internal problems—opposition to liberalism and communism and advocacy of compradore-feudalist fascism or the New Absolutism (formally still wearing the mask of the Three People's Principles).

Since Mr. Chiang's book concerns China's destiny and questions of life or death, existence or destruction, for the 450,000,000 people of China, every patriotic citizen of China, which includes all Communists, should give it his full attention.

At present, the Kuomintang is plotting to dissolve the Communist Party and to abolish the Border Region. The official Central News Agency actually broadcast such news on July 6, 1943. It may be said now that we are approaching a period characterised by a welter of peculiar opinions. We Communists cannot remain indifferent to these opinions, especially when they really play a part in events, as can be seen by reading *China's Destiny*. The criticisms here are limited to a few fundamental propositions of the book.

On the Modern Thought of China

As we know, in their aggressions against China, the imperialists have wanted the Chinese people to preserve all the old things, and have not wished them to be modernised economically, politically, or ideologically. They have not wanted the Chinese people to accept the advanced development of the West, or to have science, democracy and national consciousness, because these would turn China into a strong modern nation, which would be disadvantageous to the aggressors. Therefore the unequal treaties became fetters on the Chinese people to prevent them from accepting and developing the advanced ideas of the West. However, the theory of the author of *China's Destiny* is the opposite of this. It seems to him that it was only through the unequal treaties that the Chinese people became able to receive the advanced thought of Europe and America, and that for this reason the unequal treaties were bad. The author has tried his utmost to curse and scorn all the new culture that came after the May Fourth Movement of 1919, and his talk of the ''deepening of the influence of unequal treaties'' is aimed mostly at this point.

What was the May Fourth movement? Let us quote a paragraph from the *New Democracy* by Comrade Mao Tze-tung:—

> The May Fourth Movement was an anti-imperialist as well as an anti-feudal movement. The outstanding historical significance of the May Fourth Movement lies in the effect that it possessed a feature that was not present in the 1911 Revolution, i.e., that it opposed imperialism and feudalism in the most thorough and uncompromising way.
>
> The reason the May Fourth Movement possessed this characteristic is that the capitalist economy of China had made new steps in its development at that time, and that the revolutionary intelligentsia of China had personally witnessed the disintegration of three big imperialist countries, Russia, Germany and Austria; the wounding of two of them, Britain and France; the construction of the socialist state by the Russian proletariat; and the grip of proletarian revolutions on Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. All these things gave the new hope for the liberation of the Chinese nation. This, the May Fourth Movement broke out at the call of the world revolution, of the Russian Revolution and Lenin, and was a part of the world proletarian revolution of that time. Although we did not have a Chinese Communist Party, during the May Fourth Movement many intellectuals did possess primary Communist thoughts and approved the Russian Revolution. At its beginning, the May Fourth Movement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a united front revolutionary movement of three kinds of people, the Communistic intelligentsia, the revolutionary petit-bourgeois intelligentsia, and the bourgeois intelligentsia (which formed the Right Wing). . . .

The cultural revolution of the May Fourth Movement opposed feudal culture in a thoroughgoing way, and there was never such a great and thorough cultural revolution in the history of China. It achieved success under two banners: opposing the old morality and promoting the new morality, and opposing the old literature and promoting the new literature.

Therefore the May Fourth Movement initiated a great new epoch in the self - consciousness of the Chinese people. Without the May Fourth Movement, we could not have had the Great Revolution, the agrarian revolution and the war of resistance of the past six years. This is why the May Fourth Movement is so much hated by all reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries.

Imperialist aggression against China brought agony and bitterness to our people. It created within China a lot of imperialist lackeys, from Tseng Kuo-fan, Li Hung-chang to our disciples and grand-disciples of Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo today. These lackeys have always served the foreign aggressors and can never avoid the stigma of traitors, no matter how hard they advocate the old culture, old ethics and old moralities of China. On the other hand, this same imperialist aggression forced the Chinese peoples to wake up from their dreams and compelled them to study the advanced thought and techniques of the foreign countries—for the sake of opposing the aggressors and their lackeys. Such are the dialectics of history.

The reform of Chinese thought began from the ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity advocated by the Taiping Revolution. The "study of benevolence" preached by Tan Szu-tung represented a brave offensive against the spider-web of old Chinese ethics and morality. At that time, lackeys of the Empress Dowager, such as Yeh Teh-huei and Chang Chih-tung, and representatives of reactionary ideologics, cursed the reform movement and shouted that " ethics " and "the way of the sages" were immutable. Their ideas have been inherited by all the subsequent traitors and reactionaries of China, even up to the present moment. The May Fourth Movement was a mass movement in ideology, and many stubborn elements, reactionaries and foreign lackeys, trembled like aspen leaves before this irresistible new force. However, a historical movement is never a straight line. Some of the participants of the May Fourth Movement continued going forward, others stopped midway, while still others changed their minds and ran in the opposite direction. Today, only the Communists and revolutionary democrats of China still remain as the pillars and shock fighters of the new culture. They are heading in the only direction that will revive the Chinese nation from its moribund state. These fighters do not change or compromise. They are the greatest source of the people's national confidence and national self-respect.

The author of *China's Destiny* writes:—

Since the May Fourth Movement, the ideas of liberalism and communism have prevailed in China . . . with the result that people generally consider that all western things are right and all that belongs to China is wrong. They worship this or that foreign country, all in a similar manner. Different cliques exist among them only because there is more than one country and one foreign theory in the world. Each clique imitates one particular country and worships one particular theory, forming a group of its own, proud before its countrymen but submissive before the foreigner. Since the theories of the various countries are forever changing, the theory of each of these groups has to change unceasingly in accordance with the foreign changes.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As to the struggle between liberalism and communism, it is merely a reflection of the opposition of Anglo-American thought to that of Russia. Such theories and politics are not only unfit for the national life and the people's livelihood of China and opposed to her original cultural spirit, but they also reveal that their promoters have fundamentally forgotten that they are Chinese and have lost the standpoint of learning for China and applying their learning for China.

No doubt, the advanced ideas of different countries are not the same. There is one kind of advanced thought (e.g., democracy) which reflects a certain advanced stage (the anti-feudal stage) and is needed by a certain advanced revolutionary class at that stage; there is another kind of more advanced, or the most advanced thought (e.g., communism) which reflects a more advanced stage (anti-capitalist stage) and is needed by a more advanced revolutionary class.

Modern China finds herself in a period of great world changes, and the struggles and various relations, internal and external, of the various classes and various kinds of people in Chinese society are interwoven one with another. Therefore, even at the same time, the various schools of advanced thought in the world may be accepted by representatives of our various social classes, and co-operation of a certain type may arise among them. Here is one example. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, a revolutionary bourgeois democrat, accepted the western democratic ideas of Lincoln (of the people, by the people and for the people), together with the experience of the Russian Revolution. He said: ''I take Russia as my teacher,'' while the Chinese Communists, as the representatives of the proletariat, accepted scientific communism—Marxism-Leninism. Dr. Sun and the Communists co-operated with each other after 1924. This co-operation was beneficial to the nation as has been proved by the Great Revolution.

Again, there is another portion of our people, the liberals and the democrats, whose thoughts reflect the ideology of certain classes or strata, and who, according to their needs, may co-operate with the Communists in a certain period and on certain questions. Such co-operation is also beneficial to the nation, as has been proved by many facts. Whether this is fit for ''the national life and the people's livelihood'' depends upon one's view of the benefits of the nation and the people. Other than these, all are false issues.

It is rather peculiar that Mr. Chiang would openly oppose the liberal principles of Europe and America and the communistic principles of Russia. Do not all the fascist countries as well as their lackeys, like Wang Ching-wei, shout madly that every one must oppose liberalism and communism? Can we help fearing that as soon as they see Mr. Chiang's book, Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, Wang Ching-wei and others will think that Mr. Chiang is singing in unison with them, and that the book will shock and disappoint Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin and all anti-fascist people?

Moreover, the various countries of the world not only have their advanced and revolutionary ideas, but also reactionary and counter-revolutionary ones. Since there are progressives and reactionaries, revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries in China, therefore, world reactionary and counter-revolutionary thoughts naturally find welcomers and worshippers among certain Chinese. There is no need for us to cite examples from afar. Here is a nearby one. Are not the official Kuomintang publications *San Min Chu I Semi-Monthly* and *Central Weekly* propagating on a great scale the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini, and describing Hitler and Mussolini as two of the ''six great leaders'' of the world? Yet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this is only the surface. Besides this, there are certain groups who, fearing that fascism is too disreputable, too contrary to the national benefit, too unfavourable to the Allies, and too hand in glove with the German, Italian and Japanese robbers, dare not openly advocate it; but who try to smuggle it in as contraband under every kind of camouflage, and to peddle it everywhere. This is done, not only by the small men of the Kuomintang, but also by its important figures, as is now universally known.

As regard to the remark "proud before one's countrymen but submissive before foreigners," one should sometimes look in the mirror. There is a gentleman in China who thought, at the time of the Russian October Revolution and the Chinese Great Revolution, that the Soviet Union might be helpful to him. So he went to the Soviet Union himself, humbly asked for advice, sent his son to study there, and declared that "China's revolution must be led by the Third International." Later on, when he became anti-communistic and anti-Soviet, the same gentleman went to Tokyo to interview Mitsuru Toyama, the Japanese secret service leader, and declared that it it was necessary for China and Japan to unite. After that, he was converted to the "foreign" Christian religion. Later yet, as soon as Hitler came to power in Germany, he sent another son and a great number of his followers to study there—to learn fascism. For fully ten years, he relied on foreign funds and ammunition to fight against the revolutionary Chinese people in a war that was planned and directed by foreigners, among whom there was the famous General von Seekt, leader of the Reichswehr, and a German police chief whose special task was to teach secret service methods. Even after the outbreak of the war of resistance, he still relies on foreign powers and ammunition, and even expects the foreigners to fight the war for him. How shall we call this? Are not such actions and thoughts "proud before one's countrymen but submissive before the foreigners" and "the great hidden trouble of the national spirit"?

Now let us say something about the Communists. The thought of the Chinese nation is the thought of Mao Tze - tung — i.e., Sinoized Marxism - Leninism. As far as theory of Marxism-Leninism is concerned, the Chinese Communists not only have the same ideology as the Russian Communists but also as the Communists of the various countries of the world. However, scientific Marxism-Leninism demands that the Communists of every nation work out their political programme and decide their policies according to their own national conditions, and rely on their own people for self-salvation. The Chinese Communist Party works according to this principle. It has created all kinds of progressive forces, entirely through its own efforts, without dependence on any "foreign country." Not an item of ammunition was given it by foreign countries, nor has it ever relied on foreign funds to carry on its fight. It determines its own strategy, and is "self-resuscitating."

The Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army, led by the Chinese Communists, have resisted more than half of the Japanese forces stationed in China, and have never dreamed that the foreigners would do all the fighting for our country. In the regions under the influence of the Chinese Communists, not a single unequal treaty, or even half of a treaty, has ever been signed with the foreigners—like the Tangkhu Truce, the Ho - Umetsu Agreement and the Shanghai Truce. The policies and actions of the Chinese Communists are welcomed everywhere by the Chinese people because

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are identical with the interests of the nation and the people. The Chinese Communists have never relied on one country today and another country tomorrow, with an attitude as changeable as April showers, and have never been ''proud before their countrymen but submissive before the foreigners.'' These are the results of the thoughts of the Chinese Communist Party, which is a hundred per cent. revolutionary party of the Chinese people, ''learning for China and applying their learning for China.'' It finds no comparison in China.

It is evident that from the beginning there have been two kinds of traditional cultures in China. One belongs to the people and is revolutionary and bright; the other is against the people and is counter-revolutionary and dark. At the commencement of contemporary Chinese history, the Tai-ping Revolution and Dr. Sun were the representatives of the former, while Tseng Kuo-fan and all the anti-Communist and anti-popular elements of the present time represent the latter. Despite the fact that there was foreign ideology in the Tai-ping Revolution, ''liberty, equality and fraternity'' truly represented the thoughts of the Chinese people. The Tai-ping leaders were real Chinese heroes. Despite the fact that Tseng Kuo-fan spoke constantly of ''benevolence, righteousness, morality, and five ethical relations,'' etc., he was still a ''twofold slave to the Manchurians and to the imperialists. The Chinese Communists have succeeded to all the superior revolutionary traditions of China from ancient times down to Hung Hsiu-chuan and Dr. Sun Yat-sen, while the reactionaries have inherited the traditions of Tseng Kuo-fan and Ysh Tehhwei. The reactionaries want to abolish the progressive traditions and preserve the backward ones, while we do exactly the reverse. This is where the difference lies in regard to the question of Chinese culture and thought.

Book Reviews

Back in the old sewer

VISCOUNT MAUGHAM, who was Lord Chancellor in Mr. Chamberlain's Government at the time of the Munich Agreement, has published a little book, *The Truth about the Munich Crisis*. The aim of the book is to show that, in Lord Maugham's words, Chamberlain deserves ''the thanks of a grateful nation'' for his part in the Munich settlement, and that France also ''took a wise and correct course at Munich.''

Almost simultaneously with this book there has appeared another, *Munich: Before and After*, devoted to proving the same thing. It is by the Editor of the *Sunday Times*, Mr. W. W. Hadley, who, like Lord Maugham, was one of Neville Chamberlain's best friends. Reviews of the two books by two more of Mr. Chamberlain's friends—Lord Hankey and Mr. Tom Jones—have appeared recently in the *Observer* and the *Sunday Times:* two of the newspapers more outstandingly associated with support of Chamberlain's foreign policy.

Only political children would imagine that such publicity in favour of Chamberlain and the Munich ''settlement'' is accidental. It coincides too neatly with the campaign in Tory circles against the Three-Power Agreements of Moscow and Teheran, and for a resettlement of Europe based on an anti-Soviet bloc headed by Great Britain, which we traced last month. It coincides also with the greater vocal activity of the Chamberlainite Tories—those 280 who could still be found to vote for him on the fateful night in May, 1940, when his discredited Government was finally overthrown.

It will be necessary to return more than once to this revival of outspokenness among the most outrageous of British reactionary groups. Here one needs only to mention it. But what deserves some attention is the line of argument used by Lord Maugham. It may be fairly summarised as follows.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) Czechoslovakia had failed to reconcile or pacify its minorities, it was in an alarming internal state, and civil war was threatened; (2) Hitler said the real issue was one of self-government for the Germans in Czechoslovakia, and there was no reason to suspect him of evil intentions, or of telling lies; (3) France would not, and could not, fight: and on the attitude of France depended that of Britain; (4) Britain couldn't fight either; (5) as a matter of fact, there wasn't any obligation on them to fight for Czechoslovakia at all. (6) The League had been shown to be "unworkable" in 1937, and had ceased to exist as an effective political factor; (7) The U.S.S.R., in particular, could not be relied upon.

Anyone who likes to look up Hansard covering the debate after Munich in the House of Commons (October 4-6, 1938) will find that none of these arguments is particularly original. But the fact that their author thinks it is safe to revive them today shows that he relies on the short memories of the public, and it may therefore be useful to answer some of them.

The first two points it is hardly necessary to dwell on. Such books as Gedyes' *Fallen Bastions* and *Munich: Before and After*, by Dr. Ripka, expose the utter falseness of the arguments which Lord Maugham had borrowed direct from the Goebbels propaganda machine against the Czechoslovak Republic. He could also usefully turn up a convenient summary of Hitler's record in lying and treachery which was published by *The Times*, at the outbreak of war, in pamphlet form.

It is curious, when Lord Maugham is talking about the corruption and internal paralysis of France, that he should omit to mention that the dearest friends of Mr. Chamberlain and the Tory majority of 1938 were precisely the French big business men and politicians who effected the capitulation and betrayal of 1940, becoming the mainstays of the Vichy pro-Nazi Government, after they had effected the capitulation of Munich. But about the harrowing picture which he draws of British and French unpreparedness by land, sea and air—no tanks, no planes, no anti-aircraft guns, no British army, etc.—there are the following remarkable circumstances.

One year before, in 1937, when preparedness was at an even lower stage—and this was being widely used as an argument against supporting the Spanish Republic—Britain and France had suddenly thrown discretion to the winds, and joined with the U.S.S.R. at the Nyon Conference in defying German and Italian submarine warfare in the Mediterranean. Everyone held their breath—and the Germans and Italians submitted. Furthermore, in September, 1938, itself, the British and French Governments took action in flat contradiction to the theory that they dare not challenge the Germans. Lord Maugham himself reports it. On September 11, Chamberlain told the press that there would be "intervention by France and even Great Britain" if Hitler attacked Czechoslovakia. On September 23, the British and French Governments informed Czechoslovakia that they would support it in general mobilisation. On September 26 the Foreign Office repeated that, if Czechoslovakia were attacked, France was bound to come to her help, while "Great Britain and Russia will certainly stand by France."

If Britain and France were really as helpless as Lord Maugham pretends, how could they have successfully called the Germans' bluff in 1937, and why was it they dared to threaten Hitler against any armed attack on Czechoslovakia in 1938—but dare not warn him against attack by blackmail, which was his actual mode of procedure?

Lord Maugham uses all kinds of legal sophistries to bolster up his statement that there was no obligation on Britain and France to support, or to fight for, Czechoslovakia. The one thing he is careful to avoid mentioning is the Covenant of the League of Nations, which was a Treaty just as binding as France's pact to defend Czechoslovakia if she were attacked without provocation. For Article 16 of the Covenant clearly bound them, individually as well as collectively, to the use of "armed forces to protect the covenants of the League," to give each other mutual support "in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by a covenant-breaking State" and even to grant passage to the forces of any League member moving to attack the aggressor.

But, says Lord Maugham, the League Covenant was no longer binding, because the League "had been proved to be unworkable": other nations "were not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

willing to take action under the Covenant at the risk of war." Lord Maugham modestly omits to mention that it was the British Government under Mr. Chamberlain which took the lead among those "other nations" and made the League "unworkable." It was the British Government which refused to consider oil sanctions against Italy in January, 1936, which refused to support France in counter-measures when Hitler occupied the Rhineland in March, 1936, which led the refusal of support to Republican Spain and China against German, Italian and Japanese aggression in 1936-37. Those who wish can read the sordid story, in full detail, in the works of historians detached from politics—Professor A. B. Keith in *The Causes of the War*, or the American Professor Schuman *Europe on the Eve*.

At bottom, however, Lord Maugham rests his case on flagrant untruths about the U.S.S.R.—that the French Foreign Minister Bonnet had ascertained that "useful allies for the Czechs were not to be found" (p. 14); that in a war with Germany "France could count on no allies in the east" (p. 18); that in 1938 Russia's "military greatness was obscured by clouds" (p. 29); that the Franco-Soviet Pact of Mutual Assistance was "difficult to construe" (p. 30); that Soviet help "would not apparently have been of a very speedy kind," even if it came (p. 46); and so forth. As this latest demonstration of the Munichites is closely connected with the revival of anti-Soviet activity among the Tories which we have already mentioned, it is not without interest to show that all these insinuations are utterly groundless.

On March 17, 1938, the Soviet representatives in London, Paris, Washington and Prague had proposed to the Governments of those countries "an immediate collective deliberation of Powers, inside or outside the League, whether at Geneva or elsewhere, with a view to collective measures for protecting peace." This proposal was renewed by Litvinov to the French representative in Moscow on September 2, and by the Soviet Ambassador in London to Lord Halifax (then Foreign Secretary) on September 7. It was also repeated to the American representative in Moscow in the critical days of September 26-27.

Furthermore, on March 16, 1938, Litvinov had told the foreign pressmen in Moscow that the Soviet Union would fulfil all its pledges to Czechoslovakia. The assurance was repeated by Kalinin to the Czechoslovak workers' delegation during the May Day celebrations, by the Soviet Ambassador in Washington on May 25, by Litvinov to the French representative in Moscow on September 2, by the Soviet Government to the Czechoslovak Government on September 19, and again between September 21 and 23, and finally by Litvinov in a talk with a British Government representative at Geneva, Lord De la Warr, on September 23.

Backing these proposals with practical suggestions, Litvinov had reminded Bonnet in May, at Geneva, of the need for Franco-Soviet-Czechoslovak staff talks. He repeated this proposal on September 2 in Moscow; and Maisky in London had informed Lord Halifax five days later. In Geneva, on September 23, when Lord De la Warr asked him what ought to be done, Litvinov had again suggested staff talks.

Going still further, the Soviet Government acted on its own. Litvinov revealed at the League on September 23 that, even if France let down Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union might come to the latter's aid either (*a*) in virtue of a majority decision by the League or (*b*) "in virtue of a voluntary decision on its part." Later, in 1940, Benes revealed in a public speech in the U.S.A. that the Soviet Government had actually told him: "If the Czechoslovak Government resisted Germany, Soviet Russia would go to the aid of Czechoslovakia singlehanded.... Litvinov had succeeded in getting permission for Russian troops to cross Rumania" In the meantime, the Soviet Government, by a direct warning to the Polish representative in Moscow, at 4 a.m. on the morning of September 23, prevented the Poles from marching into Czechoslovakia —a prohibition which held good until after Munich.

Practically all these facts were revealed at one time or another by the Soviet Government itself, or else by journalists. They must have been available to Lord Maugham. His misrepresentations of the U.S.S.R. set the due stamp on the value —and the purpose—of his sudden emergence as the champion of Munich.

QUÆSTOR.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shot and Shell

Your M.P. By Gracchus (Gollancz, 2*s* 6*d*)

INDISPENSABLE SHOT and shell, to be added to the arsenal of every LABOUR MONTHLY reader alongside *Tory M.P.*, *Guilty Men* and Ivor Montagu's *Traitor Class*. The contrast between the packed condensed facts of this indictment and the thin and watery generalisations and impotent special pleading of Lord Maugham's recent apologia for Munich illustrates the difference between two worlds.

Nevertheless, there is still room and need for a fuller argued political treatment of the issues. This is necessary in order to explode the current final defence of the Munichites, who seek to escape sentence under the plea of "equal guilt" or "we are all guilty"—like the burglar's plea to the judge: "My lord, we are all miserable sinners; why pick on me?" The theory of "equal guilt" assumes that the anti-fascists, who fought fascism from the outset, who opposed Hitler's rearmament and violation of Versailles at a time when Hitler was still weak and it could easily have been checked, who stood for united armed resistance to fascist aggression and a firm Mutual Security Pact with France, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, and for rearmament on this basis, are "equally guilty" with the pro-fascists who pursued the opposite policy, assisted Hitler's rearmament and made possible the war. This last refuge of deceit will need to be finally exposed by a full confrontation of the facts and declarations on both sides, in relation to the events, from 1931 to 1941, in order to make possible a correct evaluation of the political forces in this critical testing time. Such a task, however, for which the moment is not yet ripe, goes beyond the scope of the present little book, which remains a mine of excellent propaganda material.

R.P.D.

Stalingrad Diary

Stalingrad Diary by Eric Weinert, foreword by Major J. Dugdale, M.P. (I.N.G. Publication, 48 pp., 1*s*).

THE POET Erich Weinert, whose songs were sung by the men of the International Brigades in Spain seven years ago, wrote a day-by-day diary of his experiences at Stalingrad. As President of the Free Germany National Committee in Moscow Weinert had an interview with a Red Army general a fortnight after the encircled Sixth German Army under von Paulus had no choice but surrender, but when that army was still believing Hitler's promise to rescue them from the trap. "They haven't taken any notice of the Red Army's warnings. Perhaps they'd sooner believe us Germans," said Weinert. "Try your luck," said the General.

The Diary tells the story of what happened, of Weinert crossing the Volga below Stalingrad and going up to the front line, there through loud speakers to hold argument with Hitler's dupes and to offer life and a safe return after the war. Some came over, but not many. Later, after the remnant had surrendered, there was hatred against Hitler: and amongst those whose eyes were opened, many put themselves willingly under the Free Germany Committee, including General von Seydlitz. The story of the loud-speaker within earshot of the German lines is simply and vividly told by Weinert, who noted also in his diary the verses and appeals which he wrote for leaflet distribution behind the enemy lines.

P.A.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s. Two weeks' notice is required for change of address.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GUARANTEE FUND (*Continued from page ii. of cover*).

	£	s.	d.
R. Sleep		2	6
D. Calcutt		3	0
R. Carpenter		5	0
E. McKercher		1	6
A. Phillips		5	0
S. Morrissy		12	0
G. Robson		5	0
E. Edinburgh D.G.		7	6
M. Gluckman		2	0
R. Harvey-Samuel		13	0
H. Rider		1	6
G. Mather		3	0
E. Wargent		13	0
T. Z.		2	0
Finchley D.G.		2	6
R. Benians	3	3	0
S. Craven		13	0
F. Coombes		1	6
Old Age Pensioner		1	6
J. Ruddock		13	0
A. Hickton		1	6
N. Kelly		5	0
F. Renouf		2	6
Anzio Annie	1	0	0
W. Barugh		3	0
A. Maclean		7	0
D. Smith		3	0
J. Moller		18	0
A.T.S.	1	0	0
D. Strathern & Friends		8	0
K. Thorpe		13	0
S. Clegg		5	3
J. Railly		2	0
Leeds Sympathiser	2	0	0
8th A.A.F.	2	11	6
W. Hunt		1	6
J. Laws		1	6
J. Turner		4	0
Eight of the Boys		10	0
A. Booth		8	0
Mrs. Collins		2	0
A. Levan		3	0
R. Pearson		2	6
Edinburgh D.G.		7	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
D. Rees		10	0
Payreds		3	6
G. Morey		5	0
A. Ford		5	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
Eric and Norah		10	0
J. Macdonald		6	0
J. Trott		3	0
R. Oliver		1	0
J. Burnip		5	0
Anon		13	0
D.29		2	6
F. Stehr		5	0
A. Jones		10	0
S. Barnett		3	0
W. Breach	1	0	0
Learner		2	0
R. Anderson		15	0
Director	2	0	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
J. McLean		2	6
F. Birchenough		13	0
A. Jones	1	0	0
H. Eldridge		3	0
L. Davies		1	6
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
J. B.		5	0
J. Atkinson		5	0
Morden D.G.		5	0
R. Beevers		6	10
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
H. Harper	1	2	4
P. Morris		1	6
W. Paxman		13	0
S. Lerman		3	0
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
D.C.		5	0
J. Barker		7	0
S. Smart		3	0
F. Sutton		3	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
H. Hodson		10	0
M. Mitchell	1	1	0
N. Kelly		5	0
E. McCallum		5	0
J. Bacon		4	0
W. Pennock		4	0
L. Hicks		1	6
A. Hintjens		3	6
L. Hood		13	0
J. Tigg		3	0
V. Pearson		2	6
E. Goldsworthy		7	6
D. Martin		10	0
T. Brown		7	0
C. N. C.	3	5	0
T. W. R.	1	0	0
E. Edinburgh D.G.		15	6
H. S. M.		2	6
A. Wall		5	0
Smoke		10	0
J. Scott		7	0
R.E.M.E.		10	0
R. Green		3	0
D. Evans		3	0
E. Burtweli		3	0
Radio Mech., R.E.M.E.		3	0
L'Humanite		2	0
C. Levy	1	0	0
G. Sargent		5	0
R. Ranken		7	0
F. M. R.		10	0
W. Maddison	1	0	0
J. Burnip		5	0
R. Farrell		18	6
V. Smith		5	0
F. Overington		2	6

LABOUR MONTHLY PAMPHLETS

THE MOSLEY CASE
(6d., Post 1d.)

By D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P. This lively pamphlet deals very fully with the whole case, and in particular examines the so-called "legal" and "judicial" arguments put forward by the Home Secretary and the Attorney-General.

THERE ARE NO ARYANS
(6d., Post 1d.)

By R. PAGE ARNOT. Completely exposes, by showing their lack of scientific basis, the "race theories" of the Nazis and others.

PAKISTAN AND INDIAN NATIONAL UNITY
(6d., Post 1d.)

By G. M. ADHIKARI. Presents an important new approach to the question of the Nationalities in India.

KARL MARX—POLITICAL FOUNDATIONS
(1/-, Post 1d.)

By Professor ROY PASCAL. The story of the growth of Marx's political life and thought in the year 1843.

SPECIAL OFFER!!

For Two Shillings (Post Free), we will send a parcel containing one each of all the above pamphlets.

PRODUCED 2008 BY MARX
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEMORIES of LENIN

N. K. Krupskaya

This book, which gives us a clearer picture than any other of the man who built and trained the Bolshevik Party, is reprinting and will be ready shortly.

5/-

LAWRENCE & WISHART Ltd

2 Southampton Place, W.C.1

THE SOVIET WORKER LOOKS AT THE WAR

88 pp. 2/6 (Post 2d.)

In this book will be found the main articles from issues of the Soviet Trade Union magazine: "War and the Working Class." Its four sections deal respectively with:—

I. The Anti-Hitlerite Coalition and its Policy.
II. Post-War Problems.
III. Problems of separate countries.
IV. Trade Union Problems.

Obtainable everywhere, or direct from the Publishers—

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PROPERTY OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED